

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action mailed January 19, 2005, the Examiner (1) rejected claim 1 under nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1 and 14 of *Wendlandt et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,736,773); (2) rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *De Faria-Correa et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,533,496); (3) rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Hassler* (DE Patent No. 29716512); and (4) rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Thompson* (U.S. Patent No. 5,762,603).

By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claim 1. Applicants add new claims 45-69 to further define the invention. Of these claims, claims 45, 50, 55, 61, and 66 are independent.

The originally-filed specification, claims, abstract, and drawings fully support the addition of claims 45-69. No new matter has been introduced.

I. NONSTATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 14 of Applicants' prior U.S. Patent 6,736,773. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have canceled claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection is moot and reconsideration is requested. Should the Examiner determine that new claims 45-69 are subject to a double patenting rejection, Applicants will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer at that time.

II. §102(b) REJECTIONS OF CLAIM 1

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by each of *De Faria-Correa et al.*, *Hassler*, and *Thompson*. Applicants have canceled claim 1. Accordingly, these rejections are moot.

Should the Examiner find that new claims 45-69 are not in condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to call Elizabeth Burke (202-408-4488) or Ruby Jain (202-408-4277) to discuss this application prior to issuing a new Office Action.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 13, 2005

By: Elizabeth M. Burke
Elizabeth M. Burke
Reg. No. 38,758